

REMARKS

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors.

Claim 21 has been amended to address an objection made by the Office that "it is hard to distinguish the preamble from the body of the claim".

Claims 1, 12, 21, 23, 25, and 26 have been amended.

Claims 2, 3, and 13 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1, and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,577,907 to Czyszczewski et al (Czyszczewski).

Claims 2, and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0075506 to Stevenson et al (Stevenson).

Claims 1, 4-12, 14-27 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,577,907 to Czyszczewski et al (Czyszczewski).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the elements of claims 2 and 3.

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled.

Claim 2 (and claims 11-27) is currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of U.S. Publication 2002/0075506 to Stevenson et al (Stevenson).

Since amended claim 1 includes the elements of claim 2 and 3, currently amended claim 1, claims 4-11 and claims 11-27 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Czyszczewski in view of Stevenson.

1 Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

2 **Amended independent claim 1 recites**

3 A method for providing access from a multifunction device to data  
4 operatively associated with a user-specified remote storage device,  
comprising:

5 identifying said user-specified remote storage device based at least in  
part on a path thereto specified by a user at said multifunction device;

6 establishing a link between said multifunction device and the user-  
specified remote storage device having said data operatively associated  
therewith; and

7 accessing said data operatively associated with said user-specified  
remote storage device from said multifunction device over said link  
established therebetween.

8 Czyszczewski generally is directed to multifunction devices (MFD) that are  
9 connected to modular middleware services, such as databases over a network (col.  
10 2, lines 3-6 of Czyszczewski). MFDs may access a set of global services over a  
11 communications network or may incorporate services locally (col. 2, lines 57-61 of  
12 Czyszczewski). The accessing of such services is performed by having the  
13 services routed directly to the MFD by identifying the unique network address of  
14 the MFD (col. 6, lines 43-49 of Czyszczewski). Czyszczewski relies on a  
15 predetermination and knowledge of network addresses, specifically network  
16 addresses of MFDs receiving services. Czyszczewski does not discuss network  
17 addresses of services (e.g., databases) that may be identified by MFDs and  
18 specified by a user.

19 Stevenson generally is directed to printers that receive print jobs from an  
20 authorized user. Users are authenticated (i.e., authorized/identified) by a third  
21

1 party authentication server on a network connecting the printers and users. The  
2 authentication server authenticates users through a password provided by the users.  
3 Once the authentication server authenticates the user, the user is granted access to  
4 or the ability to print to a printer on the network (paragraphs 11 and 12 of  
5 Stevenson).

6 **Amended independent claim 1** has been amended to include the element  
7 of original claim 2 which recites in part “identifying said user-specified remote  
8 storage device” and the element of claim 3 which recites “wherein identifying said  
9 user-specified remote storage device is based at least in part on a path thereto  
10 specified by a user at said multifunction device”.

11 In rejecting original claim 2 the Office admits in the present office action  
12 that Czyszczewski does not teach “identifying said user-specified remote storage  
13 device”, and relies on Stevenson as teaching this element. The Office particularly  
14 points to paragraphs 11 and 12 of Stevenson. These paragraphs, however, discuss  
15 using an authentication server to perform an identification of *users* such that  
16 authenticated users can to print to printers on a network. Stevenson does not  
17 discuss or suggest that a user might specify—“*at said multifunction device*”—a  
18 path to a remote storage device. Since Czyszczewski does not teach this claim  
19 element, and since the cited portion of Stevenson fails to teach such an element,  
20 the combination cannot fairly be said to render claim 1 obvious.

21 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be  
22 withdrawn.

23 **Dependent claims 4-11** depend from dependent claim 1 and for at least the  
24 same reasons in support of base claim 1 are allowable. Applicants respectfully  
25 request that the §103 rejection of claims 4-11 be withdrawn.

1       **Amended independent claim 12 has been amended to include the element**  
2       **of original claim 13 which recites in part "identifying a remote storage device**  
3       **having said user-requested data operatively associated therewith based at least in**  
4       **part on a path for said remote storage device specified by a user at said configured**  
5       **multifunction device".**

6       As discussed above in support of claim 1, the combination of Czyszczewski  
7       and Stevenson does not teach this identifying element. Applicants respectfully  
8       request that the §103 rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

9       **Dependent claims 14-20 depend from dependent claim 12 and for at least**  
10      **the same reasons in support of base claim 12 are allowable. Applicants**  
11      **respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 14-20 be withdrawn.**

12      **Independent claim 21 recites in part "program code for identifying data**  
13      **operatively associated with a user-specified remote storage device". As discussed**  
14      **above in support of claim 1, the combination of Czyszczewski and Stevenson does**  
15      **not teach the identifying element. Applicants respectfully request that the §103**  
16      **rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.**

17      **Dependent claims 22-27 depend from dependent claim 21 and for at least**  
18      **the same reasons in support of base claim 21 are allowable. Applicants**  
19      **respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 22-27 be withdrawn.**

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1            **CONCLUSION**

2            All pending claims 1, 4-12, 14-27 are in condition for allowance. Applicant  
3 respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject  
4 application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the  
5 Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent  
6 Action.

7            Respectfully Submitted,

8            By: 

9            Emmanuel A. Rivera  
10            Reg. No. 45,760  
11            (509) 324-9256 ext. 245

12            Dated: 6/23/04

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25